

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 11 and 17 are amended herein. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the amendments and arguments set forth below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21 and 24-26

Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent Application Publication Number US 2002/0156929 by Hekmatpour (hereafter referred to as “Hekmatpour”), in view of United States Patent Number 6,634,008 to Dole (hereafter referred to as “Dole”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully direct the Examiner to independent Claim 1, which recites method of generating a project datasheet in an integrated design environment comprising (emphasis added):

accessing project data from an XML database structure, said project data from the integrated design environment and for describing an electronic system design for implementation on a microcontroller programmable system on a chip;
accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets; and processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file, wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data.

Independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1. Claims 2-10 depend from independent Claim 1 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 12-16 depend from independent Claim 11 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 18-23 depend from independent Claim 17 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Claims 25-26 depend from independent Claim 24 and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully assert that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets” and “processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file” as recited in independent Claim 1. The present application discloses accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets and processing project data according to an XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand Hekmatpour to teach a computer-based design framework for collaborative design of a product by distributed design team members (Abstract). However, this is very different than formatting project data directed to project datasheets to produce a project datasheet file as claimed. Moreover, Applicants respectfully assert that Hekmatpour is silent with respect to the formatting and creation of project datasheets. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets and processing project data according to an XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file as claimed.

Furthermore, Hekmatpour teaches using a design framework for purposes other than creation and formatting of a project datasheet as claimed. As such, Hekmatpour effectively teaches away from the claimed embodiments.

Applicants respectfully assert that Dole fails to teach or suggest the limitations of “accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets” and “processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file” as recited in independent Claim 1. As such, Dole, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, fails to cure the deficiencies of Hekmatpour discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1.

The present rejection states that Hekmatpour fails to teach or suggest “wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data” as recited in independent Claim 1. Applicants concur with the Examiner.

Applicants respectfully assert that that Dole, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour, also fails to teach or suggest “wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data” as recited in independent Claim 1. The present application discloses the creation of a project datasheet file including integrated circuit pinout assignment data.

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understand the cited portion of Dole to teach an integrated circuit comprising blocks, where each block represents a portion of circuitry inside the integrated circuit (Figure 1; col. 1, lines 20-47). However, Applicants respectfully assert that a grouping of the

circuitry within an integrated circuit into “blocks” is not pinout assignment data as claimed. Moreover, Figure 1 clearly shows that the blocks are within the integrated circuit, and therefore, not pinout assignments. As such, Applicants respectfully assert that Dole fails to teach or suggest that a project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data as claimed.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record. Since independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 contain limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 11, 17 and 24 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Since dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, dependent Claims 4-5, 8-9, 13-14, 16, 20-21 and 25-26 are also not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole. Thus, Claims 1, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14, 16-17, 20-21, and 24-26 are therefore allowable.

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22

Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Dole, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,748,569 to Brooke (hereafter referred to as “Brooke”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole and further in view of Brooke for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Brooke, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Dole, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Dole combination discussed above with respect to independent Claims 1, 11, 17 and 24. Specifically, Brooke fails to teach or suggest the limitations “accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets,” “processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file” and “wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data” as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole and further in view of Brooke. Thus, Claims 2-3, 6, 12, 15, 18-19 and 22 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record, and are therefore allowable.

Claim 10

Claim 10 are rejected in the present Office Action under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hekmatpour in view of Dole, and further in view of United States Patent Number 6,704,893 to Bauwens (hereafter referred to as “Bauwens”). Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully assert that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claim 10 are not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole and further in view of Bauwens for the following reasons.

Applicants respectfully assert that Bauwens, either alone or in combination with Hekmatpour and/or Dole, fails to cure the deficiencies of the Hekmatpour/Dole combination discussed above with respect to independent Claim 1. Specifically, Bauwens fails to teach or suggest the limitations “accessing an XSL stylesheet directed to project datasheets,” “processing said project data according to said XSL stylesheet to automatically produce a project datasheet file” and “wherein said project datasheet file includes integrated circuit pinout assignment data” as recited in independent Claim 1. Consequently, since Claim 10 recites further limitations to the invention claimed in independent Claim 1, Claim 10 is not rendered obvious by Hekmatpour in view of Dole and further in view of Bauwens. Thus, Claim 10 overcomes the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and is therefore allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-6, 8-22 and 24-26 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 23-0085.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP

Dated: 4/13, 2006

BMF

Bryan M. Failing
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113
(408) 938-9060